

PLAN COMMISSION

August 12, 2019

7:00 PM

MINUTES

Approved: _____

John Mullane

Date: _____

9/16/2019

I. ROLL CALL:

	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
V. Armouti	M. Boline	M. Brandmeyer
G. Coffey	D. Gerber	J. McDole
J. Mullane	M. Pierceall	K. West
M. Rabe	B. Schlueter	
E. Fultz, Staff	C. Porter, Staff	
E. Williams, Staff	L. Schneck, Staff	
W. Williams, Staff	C. Louer, Alderman W6	
M. Blue, 627 Grove St., Evanston, IL		
A. Conner, 232 S. Main St., Edwardsville, IL		
R. Helmkamp, 4709 S. Hazel Rd., Edwardsville		
A. & T. Unger, 534 Edwardsville Rd., Troy, IL		
B. Kreamalmeyer, 213A Hazel St, Troy, IL		
D. Bass, 371 Hillsboro Ave., Edwardsville, IL		
C. Bennyhoff, 1 North Research Dr., Edwardsville, IL		
W. Croull, 110 E. Park St., Edwardsville, IL 62025		

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Minutes of the regular meeting for July 15, 2019.

MOTION: Armouti. Move the minutes be approved as submitted. SECONDED: Gerber. All Ayes.

Minutes of the July 15, 2019 meeting hereby approved.

III. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Case 2019-23 Timberlake Village
 PUD Amendment
 Property Owner/Developer: Unger Eye Care
 Engineer: Thouvenot, Wade and Moerchen, Inc.

Emily Fultz gave staff's report. The property is located at the southwest quadrant of State Route 157 and Lewis Road. This pertains to Lot 3 of Timberlake Village PUD. The original PUD was approved in 2006. There have been amendments in 2016, 2017, and also 2018. The amendment for this meeting is for the vacation of the sewer easement. The placement of Unger Eye Care on this lot requires the relocation of the sewer line that runs through the site. The developers will reroute the portion of the sewer line within this easement and abandon the existing line.

John Mullane wanted to make clear that the previously approved uses have not changed. The building

footprint has not changed. The only change will be the placement of the sewer line.

Emily Fultz stated the sewer line will be routed around the underground detention, located to the north of the proposed building.

Michael Boline asked if Public Works has reviewed the proposed plans. Emily Fultz stated Engineering staff has reviewed the proposed relocation and approved the location presented. Mr. Boline stated he reviewed the easement vacation which is only 7.81 feet.

Justin Venvertloh with TWM is present to answer questions. He stated there is an overall easement on the northern property line which goes all the way up to the portion of the easement being vacated. They are only vacating the portion that will be located within the building footprint. They will be relocating the sanitary sewer within the remainder of the easement along the northern property line. It will turn and go to the south and connect to the existing manhole. The existing Timberlake retail is using the current sanitary sewer line so it will remain in service until the new main is complete at which time it will be switched over.

Mark Rabe stated there was an in depth discussion when the development went in as to the right-in / right-out on State Route 157. There are no markings at that entrance stating such. Justin Venvertloh stated the original design was not done by the current owners. Emily Fultz stated that would be something for staff to look at.

No one present to speak against the PUD amendment.

No one present to speak in favor of the PUD amendment.

MOTION: Rabe. Move to approve the vacation of the easement as noted. SECONDED: Pierceall.
VOICE ROLL CALL: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Abstains.

- B. Case 2019-29 Zoning Code Update – Phase 1
1. Section 1242.03.1 – Central Business District (B-1);
 2. Section 1242.03.3 – Downtown Mixed Use District (MU-1); and
 3. Section 1252 – Definitions
 4. Section 1240.01 – Purpose
 5. Section 1242.03 – Business
 6. Section 1242.04 – Instances when a PUD is required
 7. Section 1246.01 – Establishment
 8. Section 1246.07 – Comparative table
 9. Section 1248.02.2 – Fences, walls, and hedges
 10. Section 1250.13 – Parking. Subsection (j) – Residential Districts
 11. Section 1250.13 – Parking. (k) – Business, Manufacturing, and Industrial Districts
 12. Zoning Map Amendment – Creating the B-1A, B-1B, and B-1C districts.

Emily Fultz gave staff's report on the zoning code update. The City adopts the Comprehensive Plan approximately once every 20 years. This gives the overall visions and goals of the city related to development within the community. The Zoning Code implements the policy and vision set forth in the Comprehensive Plan. It regulates land use, sets bulk standards (i.e. building height and building setbacks) and identifies procedures. In 2017, the City engaged Teska to read through the Land Development Code and Zoning Code and evaluate them. It was suggested to update several areas within these codes. This will be a three phase project. Phase 1 is what the focus is on for this meeting. It will update the definition section and create new text for the B-1 and MU-1 districts. These changes were the result of public engagement.

Last October, they City had an open house which was well attended by 40-50 people. This was to get feedback from the public. On October 4, 2018, they also had their first Zoning Advisory Group meeting. They did a walking tour through downtown and also encouraged the public to do the same.

There was a guide map with stops throughout downtown. During these stops it was suggested to look around the area and note things that should be kept and maintained or things that should be done differently in that particular area in the future. On February 11, 2019, the first draft was prepared. It was reviewed by the Ordinance Committee of the Plan Commission in March and again in April. An information meeting was held on July 17, 2019 with the property owners in the B-1 zoning district. They were notified by mail of this meeting and encouraged to attend. They have also been engaged on social media. This has led to the downtown zoning district.

Emily Fultz displayed the existing B-1 zoning boundaries which would not change as a result of this update. There will be three sub-districts will deal with the bulk standards. The use regulations will be the same in each district. The zoning map will consist of B-1A, B-1B, and B-1C districts.

B-1A – Central Main Street

This district focuses on the downtown core. This is the area which they are most concerned with preserving the historic character and pedestrian focus. They want storefronts to be engaging to pedestrians. They would like to set height limits. The height limit would be set at five (5) stories with the top two (2) stories having a minimum setback of twenty-five (25) feet. With the feedback from the meetings, the public did not want to see a five (5) story building with a front yard setback on the front property line. They felt it would take away from the historic character of downtown. Another change would be applying form based code elements to set standards for the historic character. Last, it implements the Comprehensive Plan by establishing the form based elements.

B-1B – Mid-Downtown

This district will allow for slightly larger developments and still allow for five (5) stories. It would allow those five (5) story buildings to be placed between five (5) feet and twenty (20) feet from the front property line. This will allow for architectural variety and visual interest for pedestrians.

B-1C – Downtown Transition

This district is nearest to the residential districts. This district will have a three (3) story height limit to avoid any impact on the residential areas.

Emily Fultz wanted to point out the permitted uses and special uses are very similar to what exists now. The language has been updated to use terms that are used now. The biggest change to these uses is office use when located on the first floor and part of a site designated as in the B-1A district, Central Main Blockface would have to get a Special Use permit but allowed by right in the other sub-districts on the first floor.

MU-1 – Downtown Mixed Use District

This will be a new district. It will promote walkability and pedestrian activity. There are three elements in the commercial areas: the downtown walkable area, the large shopping centers for automobile access and then there is the area in between. This area can be accessed by pedestrians and also automobiles. The MU-1 district acknowledges automobile use. This district will support business development in and around the downtown area but also allow for a variety of housing options. It will also allow for redevelopment at a neighborhood scale and encourage the reuse of existing buildings.

They have not identified any properties to rezone at this time. They want to be clear as to what the vision is for this mixed use area. The next step would be engaging the property owners as to what properties to rezone.

This area would allow for strictly business and strictly residential uses. It would also allow for mixed use buildings by right. Minimum lot sizes are smaller in this area to allow for what exists today. As an example if someone owns an existing home and wants to convert it into a business or vice versa, it would be allowed. Residences above the first floor will be permitted out right. Special uses will be similar to the B-1 district.

Phase 1 will also update the definitions. The definitions will be updated with each phase with new

language in the code sections that will be adopted. This update will modernize the terminology. As an example nursing homes would be split into skilled care facilities, memory care facilities and assisted living facilities. They will also add terms used in B-1 and MU-1 districts. They will also want to update language to reflect best practices.

The updates will be to the following sections.

Section 1240.01 – Purpose

Section 1242.03 – Business

Section 1242.04 – Instances when a PUD is required

Section 1246.01 – Establishment

Section 1246.07 – Comparative Table

Section 1248.02.2 – Fences, walls, and hedges

Section 1250.13 – Parking. Subsection (j) – Residential Districts

Section 1250.13 – Parking. Subsection (k) – Business, Manufacturing, and Industrial Districts

The board is being asked to approve the three new subsections in the B-1 district, the new MU-1 district, the updated definitions, and also the zoning map update.

This information has been updated on the city's website.

No one present to speak in favor of these changes.

No one present to speak against these changes.

Discussion on properties that have street frontage on both sides of the property. Emily Fultz stated the blockface is based on the front of the buildings even though they extend to the street at the rear of the property. Michael Boline asked if the bank property on Vandalia would get divided and the parking lot would be sold, would the zoning change if a new structure would front Park Street. Emily Fultz stated that was a good question. Ideally, it would. It would be zoned based on the frontage of the building.

Greg Coffey suggested to double check both maps to compare the proposed zoning districts. It doesn't appear to match each other. He also suggested adding to the definitions "property line".

Andrew Connor, 232 S. Main Street, present to ask a question. He owns residential property on South Main Street which is now non-conforming. He wants to make sure he will be able to continue to use the property for residential purposes. Emily Fultz replied that he will be able to continue to use the property as is. The only time that will change if the use is abandoned for one year or increase the size of the structure. The code does not allow for the expansion of a non-conforming use.

Greg Coffey asked about the changes in the ordinance stating pergola, trellis and decorative fencing is encouraged for creating the continuation of the blockface when there is not a building present, but why not mandated. Emily Fultz stated they want to allow some flexibility for developers to figure out how they will mitigate the parking visible from the street.

Veronica Armouti asked if it states they are encouraged and they decide not to put anything in since it is stated encouraged. Emily Fultz stated on Page 5, (a.) states screening is required. Further down on the same page under (c.) it gives some options for screening. The idea is to maintain the blockface and separation from the private and public areas. The intention is to maintain the feel and character of the downtown area.

Michael Blue with Teska wanted to add the intent in general is perimeter landscaping so when a pedestrian is walking by, they are not looking at the headlights of cars. In some of the downtown areas, there will not be enough area for landscaping between the parking lot and sidewalk. In those areas, the idea is to put a trellis or pergola or physical structure so there is something to create the condition described by Emily Fultz earlier.

Beth Schlueter asked if the architectural standards would apply to all 3 sub-districts within the B-1

district. Emily Fultz replied yes. Beth Schlueter stated on Page 6, (3) b. it states the building elements shall be used to align with and complement such elements on adjacent buildings. Would this be enough detail to prevent another building like the auto store on Buchanan Street? Emily Fultz stated that property is not located within the B-1 zoning district. The next phase (Phase 2) of this process will address building code guidelines.

Greg Coffey asked how this would work with an area like South Main Street where there are residential buildings which have been converted to commercial uses and new construction as well. The way this section reads, the new construction would have to conform to the residential structures. Emily Fultz stated staff understands that new commercial development would not match the look of the residential homes but there could be elements, such as the number of stories, which would maintain the look of the block.

Michael Blue wanted to point out a new office building going in next to a house could consider it to only be a two (2) story building with windows which look like the houses next door. The new building could be on the same scale and have elements that would match the house next door. He also used the courthouse and administration building on Main Street. Both buildings are completely different but the windows are on the same level. The molding in the windows is comparable and the lettering on the fronts of the buildings is also the same. They couldn't be more different buildings and the era they were building along with the style of each building but they complement each other.

Greg Coffey stated the definitions they were given in the packets are not all highlighted. It is not clear to him what exactly has changed. He would like to see a comparative draft to see the differences. He is okay with moving everything forward as long as ACS recognizes that Plan Commission does not know precisely what has changed in the definitions. He knows that the Ordinance Committee has been through it and staff has reviewed it. If there is no urgency, he would prefer holding it.

Mark Rabe stated he was uncomfortable moving forward without reviewing the red line version or a checklist of changes from a previous meeting.

MOTION: Rabe. Move to table. SECONDED: Coffey.

The board request staff provide changes made to the propose language in the definitions.

VOICE ROLL CALL: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Abstains.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

None.

V. NEW BUSINESS

None.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

David Gerber moved to adjourn. All Ayes.